

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

FAIZA ABU,

Plaintiff,

V.

PIRAMCO SEA-TAC INC., d/b/a BEST  
WESTERN AIRPORT EXECUTEL,

Defendant,

Case No. C08-1167RSL

**ORDER GRANTING  
STIPULATED MOTION TO SEAL**

This matter comes before the Court on the parties' stipulated motion to seal plaintiff's medical records filed as exhibits four and five to the Declaration of Suzanne Thomas in support of defendant's pending motion to compel. The parties have stipulated that exhibits four and five may be filed under seal because of the personal and private nature of the medical records. The Court finds that the medical records and references to them in the memorandum and declaration are private and that the public's interest in viewing the documents is minimal. Accordingly, the stipulated motion to seal exhibits four and five (Dkt. #33) is GRANTED.

However, defendant filed the entire motion to compel, proposed order, and supporting declaration under seal. The parties have not shown good cause to seal the

1 entire filing. The Court cannot selectively unseal portions of the filing because defendant  
2 did not separately file exhibits four and five. Accordingly, defendant is ORDERED to  
3 file, within ten days of the date of this order, an unsealed copy of the proposed order and  
4 exhibits one, two, and three.

5 The parties have supplied, at docket #35, a redacted copy of the memorandum and  
6 declaration, redacting two sentences from the memorandum and one sentence from the  
7 declaration that reference the contents of plaintiff's medical records. The redacted copies  
8 afford the public the opportunity to view the non-private material. Therefore, the  
9 originally filed documents (Dkt. #31) may remain under seal.

10 After the parties filed their stipulation, but pursuant to it, they filed portions of  
11 their response and reply under seal. Plaintiff filed under seal an exhibit to her opposition.  
12 That exhibit (Dkt. #38) contains private medical information and it may remain sealed.  
13 Defendants filed portions of their reply under seal, including two exhibits that reference  
14 plaintiff's sensitive personal information. Defendants filed redacted copies of their reply  
15 memorandum and supporting declaration which redacted only a few sentences that  
16 referenced the private information. Therefore, portions of defendant's reply (Dkt. #46)  
17 can remain under seal.

18

19 DATED this 23rd day of February, 2009.

20

21

  
Robert S. Lasnik

22 Robert S. Lasnik  
23 United States District Judge  
24  
25

26

ORDER GRANTING STIPULATED  
MOTION TO SEAL - 2